

A2
cancel
less than optimal settings.

Claim 16, line 2, please delete "disabling" and insert therefore -- disrupting --.

Claim 17, line 2, please delete "disabling" and insert therefore -- disrupting --.

REMARKS

Upon entry of the present amendment the claims under consideration remain claims 1-18.

All claims stand rejected, per paper no. 3, under 35 U.S.C. Sec. 112, 2nd paragraph. The Examiner has complained of several word usages, which he deems indefinite and unclear. The present amendments are believed to have obviated the majority of these rejections. The Applicants respectfully traverse such rejections as are based on the following terms which are believed to be standard English usage and/or are adequately defined within the specification and as such are believed to need no further amendment: "normal"; "remote control unit"; "audio visual display device"; "disrupted"; "substantially"; "disruption". Specifically, "remote control unit" is ubiquitous in the English language with respect to "audio visual display devices" (see also page 3, line 23 and page 1, line 9, respectively). "Substantially" is a term of art also which has heretofore been readily accepted in the field of patents scrivener. "Activation code" is believed to be adequately defined from a reading of the specification (see particularly page 5, line 25).

The lack of antecedent basis in claim 1 for "audio visual receiver" has been corrected.

The complained of phraseology, "contrast and brightness minimums", in claims 3 and 13 is believed to have been corrected by the present amendment. In addition, the Applicants respectively point out that "contrast and brightness" are standard and universally accepted terms of art concerning the optics of "visual display devices" and would be readily understood by those having ordinary skill in the art.

The complained of phraseology of claim 11 has been amended hereby to obviate the Examiner's rejection.

The complained of forms of "disrupt" and "disabling" have been amended hereby to obviate the Examiner's rejection.

It is believed that the present amendments and discussion herein have obviated all the Examiner's outstanding rejections. All claims are now believed to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention under the accepted legal standards of claim construction.

Should the Examiner have further objections to the language of the application as presently constituted after entry of the present amendment, he is invited to call the Applicant's undersigned attorney to discuss the same.

All claims are now believed to be placed in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Favorable consideration is requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Roland W. Norris
Reg. No. 32,799

RWN/pe

ZENITH ELECTRONICS CORP.
1000 Milwaukee Ave.
Glenview, IL. 60025
708-391-8001

